

EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

_		TIROT MANER I	NVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED I	INVENTOR		
09/375,514	 08/17/9	9 REED		J	3335-075-55-
_			コ		EXAMINER
				SCHMIDT,M	
HM22/0620 LAURA A. CORUZZI PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PENNIE & E 1155 AVENU NEW YORK N	E OF THE A	MEKICHE		1635 DATE MAILEI	(V)

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	09/375,514	REED, JOHN C.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mary Schmidt	1635	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	nears on the cover she	et with the correspondence address	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		F 2 MONTH(S) FROM	
eriod for Reply	LY IS SET TO EXPIR	RE 3 MONTH(S) FROM	
 THE MAILING DATE Of Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a real find period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for period for reply will, by statused period for reply will be statused period for reply will be	eply within the statutory minimu	um of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.	
Status	·		
1) Responsive to communication(s) field on	This action is non-fina	al.	is
3) Since this application is in condition for allocation in accordance with the practice und	ler Ex parte Quayle,	7930 C.D. 11, 400 C.C. 210.	
Disposition of Claims	votion		
	Jauon.	ation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from considera		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>53-63</u> is/are rejected.			
· / abjected IO		ment	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to: 8) Claims are subject to restriction a	nd/or election require	211101117	
Application Papers	aminer.		
9) The specification is objected to by the LA	ected to by the Examin	ner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by	ıis: a)∏ appr	roved b)☐ disapproved.	
The proposed drawing correction filed on	·		
11) The proposed drawing 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by	are energiness.		
		25 U.S.C. & 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	foreign priority under	30 U.S.O. & LIV(A) (A) 3. (1)	
a) All b) Some c) Notice of the priority doc	cuments have been re	eceived.	
1. Certified copies of the priority doc	cuments have been re	received in Application No Is have been received in this National Stag	ie
2. Certified copies of the priority doc	the priority documents	is have been received in this National Stagule 17.2(a)).	, ~
annication non the manning	certitle	id copies not receive	
annication non the manning	certitle	id copies not receive	
* See the attached detailed Office action f	for domestic priority u	KATRINA TURNER PATENT ANALYST	•
		DTO 413) Paper No(s)	
Attachment(s) 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-1449)		18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-	152)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 01-01)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/375,514

Art Unit: 1635

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: (1) Lines 10-14 of the first page of the specification as filed need to be canceled since the Amendment to the first line of the specification (Amendment A1) provides duplicate information. (2) Also, the status of allowed Applications 08/080,285 and 08/465,485 in the first line of the specification needs to include the issued patent numbers. (3) Further, the brief description of the drawings needs to reference the sequences in the figures by sequence identifiers.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/375,514

Art Unit: 1635

Claim 53 is indefinite for the language "consisting of from 10-35 bases and comprising" SEQ ID NO:17 since SEQ ID NO:17 is 18 bases long and thus the 10-17 base long anticodes as claimed could not comprise SEQ ID NO:17.

Claim 55 is indefinite for the language "wherein said anticode oligomer is ... complementary to a portion of the region of the splice acceptor site or splice donor site of the pre-mRNA encoding the bcl-2 gene" since it is not clear how many splice acceptor or donor sites there are in the disclosed bcl-2 gene sequence. If there is more than one such site, the claim as written is indefinite.

4. Claims 54-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 54-63 are drawn to anticode oligomers to the pre-mRNA, splice donor or splice acceptor sites, 5' UTR of the mRNA or any portion of the mRNA of bcl-2. The specification as filed teaches antisense to the human bcl-2 gene but does not disclose the gene sequence from other species of bcl-2 nor antisense to said sequences.

One skilled in the art would not have been in possession of the scope of antisense anticodes claimed to any bcl-2 gene in the art at the time the invention was made. Design of an

Application/Control Number: 09/375,514

Art Unit: 1635

antisense oligonucleotide to a target gene sequence is dependent on knowing the target gene sequence. The scope of possible bcl-2 genes was not disclosed at the time the invention was made such that one skilled in the art would have a representative number of species in which to design antisense to from the genus of all possible bcl-2 gene sequences.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ormum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b). disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.7

Claims 53-63 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 5,831,066. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims drawn to anticode oligonucleotides directed to bcl-2 mRNA, and specifically the composition of SEQ ID NO:17, are encompassed by the methods and kits of '066 which include anticode oligonucleotides to bcl-2mRNA and the sequence of SEQ ID NO:17.

Application/Control Number: 09/375,514

Art Unit: 1635

7. Claims 53-63 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,040,181. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims drawn to anticode oligonucleotides directed to bcl-2 mRNA, and specifically the composition of SEQ ID NO:17, are encompassed by the methods of '181 which include anticode oligonucleotides to bcl-2 mRNA and the sequence of SEQ ID NO:17.

- 8. The claims are free of the prior art, antisense to bcl-2, prior to December 22, 1988, the filing date of U.S. Application No. 07/288,692.
- 9. Should all claims be found allowable, the prevalence of antisense to bcl-2 in the post art would suggest that there will be a high potential for interference of any broad claims to human bcl-2.

·

Page 6

Art Unit: 1635

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Mary M. Schmidt*, whose telephone number is (703) 308-4471.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *John LeGuyader*, may be reached at (703) 308-0447.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Analyst, *Katrina Turner*, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3413.

M. M. Schmidt June 18, 2001

ROBERT A. SCHWARTZMAN

Mysens